

Via Facsimile (571) 273-8300

Atty. Dkt. No.: 18150 (AT 20958-2136)
PATENT**Remarks**

The Office Action mailed January 11, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

Claims 5, 11, 13, 16 and 20 have been indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form. The examiner is thanked for indicating these claims allowable. Claims 13 and 16 have been rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Barker et al. (USP 6,866,541) ("Barker"). Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Belaidi et al. (USP 6,866,541) ("Belaidi"). Claims 1, 12, and 21-24 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Knickerbocker (USP 4,150,867). These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

Turning to the 102 rejection to Barker, the above claim amendments are believed to render moot the rejection. Specifically, the subject matter of claim 21 has been added to claim 1. The Office Action does not indicate, and the Applicants submit, that Barker does not describe a patch panel system having connector ports on at least three sections of a patch panel. Additionally, Barker does not suggest a motivation to provide a patch panel system having connector ports on at least three sections of a patch panel. Thus claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Barker. Furthermore, the subject matter of claim 24 has been added to claim 12. The Office Action does not indicate, and the Applicants submit, that Barker does not describe a patch panel having connector ports on immediately adjacent sections of a patch panel. Additionally, Barker does not suggest a motivation to provide a patch panel having connector ports on immediately adjacent sections of a patch panel. Thus claim 12 is submitted to be patentable over Barker. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, independent claims 1 and 12 are submitted to be patentable over Barker.

Via Facsimile (571) 273-8300

Atty. Dkt. No.: 18150 (AT 20958-2136)
PATENT

Turning to the 102 rejection to Belaidi, the above claim amendments are believed to render moot the rejection. Specifically, the subject matter of claim 21 has been added to claim 1. The Office Action does not indicate, and the Applicants submit, that Belaidi does not describe a patch panel system having connector ports on at least three sections of a patch panel. Additionally, Belaidi does not suggest a motivation to provide a patch panel system having connector ports on at least three sections of a patch panel. Thus claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Belaidi. The subject matter of claim 24 has been added to claim 12. The Office Action does not indicate, and the Applicants submit, that Belaidi does not describe a patch panel having connector ports on immediately adjacent sections of a patch panel. Additionally, Belaidi does not suggest a motivation to provide a patch panel having connector ports on immediately adjacent sections of a patch panel. Thus claim 12 is submitted to be patentable over Belaidi. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, independent claims 1 and 12 are submitted to be patentable over Belaidi.

Turning to the 102 rejection to Knickerbocker, Knickerbocker does not describe nor suggest a patch panel system as recited in claim 1. More specifically, Knickerbocker does not describe nor suggest a patch panel having first connectivity interface having multiple sections extending along a substantially arcuate path and joined to form an N-sided portion of a polygon. The Office Action suggest at page 4 that Knickerbocker's horizontal support means 74 are patch panels having a first connectivity interface with multiple sections. Applicants strenuously disagree that the horizontal support means 74 describe or even suggest patch panels having such structure. Rather, the horizontal support means 74 are each linear supports having a single section. As such, the horizontal support means 74 do not describe nor suggest a structure having a first connectivity interface having multiple sections extending along a substantially arcuate path and joined to form an N-sided portion of a polygon as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, Knickerbocker does not describe nor suggest connector ports provided on at least three of the multiple sections of the first connectivity interface as recited in claim 1. As indicated above, Knickerbocker does not describe a patch panel having a first connectivity interface with multiple sections, and thus does not describe nor suggest having connector ports provided on at least three of the multiple sections of the first connectivity interface. Rather, the

Via Facsimile (571) 273-8300

Atty. Dkt. No.: 18150 (AT 20958-2136)
PATENT

horizontal support means 74 are linear and include only a single section. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Knickerbocker.

Turning to claim 12, Knickerbocker does not describe nor suggest a patch panel having first connectivity interface having multiple sections extending along a substantially arcuate path and joined to form an N-sided portion of a polygon. The Office Action suggest at page 4 that Knickerbocker's horizontal support means 74 are patch panels having a first connectivity interface with multiple sections. Applicants strenuously disagree that the horizontal support means 74 describe or suggest patch panels having such structure. Moreover, the horizontal support means 74 are each linear supports having a single section. As such, the horizontal support means 74 do not describe nor even suggest a structure having a first connectivity interface having multiple sections extending along a substantially arcuate path and joined to form an N-sided portion of a polygon as recited in claim 12.

Moreover, Knickerbocker does not describe nor suggest connector ports provided on immediately adjacent sections of the multiple sections of the first connectivity interface as recited in claim 12. As indicated above, Knickerbocker does not describe a patch panel having a first connectivity interface with multiple sections, and thus does not describe nor suggest having connector ports provided on immediately adjacent sections of the first connectivity interface. Rather, the horizontal support means 74 are linear and include only a single section. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 12 is submitted to be patentable over Knickerbocker.

With regard to the dependent claims, it is submitted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the dependent claims. Turning specifically to the rejections of claims 21 and 23, Applicants traverse the assertion that Knickerbocker discloses "that said connector ports are provided on at least three of said multiple sections of said first connectivity interface." As indicated above, Knickerbocker does not describe a patch panel having a first connectivity interface with multiple sections, and thus does not describe nor suggest having connector ports provided on at least three of the multiple sections of the first connectivity interface. Rather, the horizontal support means 74 are linear and include only a single section.

Via Facsimile (571) 273-8300

Atty. Dkt. No.: 18150 (AT 20958-2136)
PATENT

Turning specifically to the rejections of claims 22 and 24, Applicants traverse the assertion that Knickerbocker discloses "that said connector ports are provided on immediately adjacent sections of said multiple sections of said first connectivity interface." As indicated above, Knickerbocker does not describe a patch panel having a first connectivity interface with multiple sections, and thus does not describe nor suggest having connector ports provided on immediately adjacent sections of the first connectivity interface. Rather, the horizontal support means 74 are linear and include only a single section.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jay J. Hoette

Registration No. 50,666
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070